## Case 2:01-cr-00269-JAM Document 62 Filed 06/07/06 Page 1 of 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,		)
	Plaintiff,	) No Cr.S-01-0269-DFL
v. EDWARD LEON MITCHELL,	Defendant.	DETENTION ORDER (Violation of Pretrial Release, Probation or Supervised Release)
finds: there is presumption to presumption to another cond condition defends the condition.	robable cause to be crime while on reshat his release we har and convincinition of release and eased on the factorion or combination of the combination will not flee mmunity or e person is unlik	§ 3148 (violation of pretrial release order), the court believe the person has committed a federal, elease and defendant has not rebutted the rill endanger another or the community or ng evidence that defendant has violated and rs set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) there is no on of conditions of release that will assure that the or pose a danger to the safety of another person or tely to abide by any condition or combination of F.R.Cr.P. 32.1(a)(D), 46(c), 18 U.S.C. § 3148.
(violation of probatio to believe defendant has not me	on or supervised that violated a control this burden of each	32.1(a)(6) and 46(c) and 18 U.S.C. § 3143 release) the court finds there is probable cause ndition of probation or supervised release and stablishing by clear and convincing evidence to another person or to the community. 18
custody of the Attorney General for opracticable, from persons awaiting of defendant shall be afforded reasonably order of a court of the United States	confinement in a or serving sentence ble opportunity for or request of an endant is confine	§ 3142(i)(2)-(4) defendant is committed to the a corrections facility separate, to the extent ces or being held in custody pending appeal. The or private consultation with his counsel. Upon further attorney for the United States the person in charge of d shall deliver defendant to a United States Marshal ourt proceeding.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DATED: <u>06/07/06</u>

<sup>\*</sup> The court also notes defendant's failure to appear on 4/20/06 in response to district court order to appear.